

A Note on the Majorana Theory for $j = 1/2$ and $j = 1$ Particle States*

Valeri V. Dvoeglazov[†]

*Escuela de Física, Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas
Antonio Dovalí Jaime s/n, Zacatecas 98000, ZAC., México
Internet address: VALERI@BUFA.EDUAZ.MX
(December 30, 1994)*

Abstract

The wave equations for self/anti-self conjugate Majorana-McLennan-Case $j = 1/2$ and $j = 1$ spinors, proposed by Ahluwalia, are re-written to covariant form. The connection with the Foldy-Nigam-Bargmann-Wightman-Wigner (FNBWW) type quantum field theory is discussed.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Pm, 11.30.Er, 14.60.Pq, 14.60.St

Typeset using REVTeX

*Submitted to the XVIII Oaxtepec Symp. on Nuclear Physics. 4-7 de enero de 1995.

[†]On leave of absence from *Dept. Theor. & Nucl. Phys., Saratov State University, Astrakhanskaya ul., 83, Saratov RUSSIA*. Internet address: dvoeglazov@main1.jinr.dubna.su

Thanks to electroweak theory we have accustomed to thinking of a neutrino ν and its antineutrino $\bar{\nu}$ as distinct particles. A number of precise experiments confirmed the Weinberg-Salam-Glashow model. However, the present situation in neutrino physics seems to me to be not satisfactory. Modern experiments and observations brought many “black spots” at the cloudless sky of the Standard Model (SM). They are: the solar neutrino puzzle, the negative mass squared problem, the atmospheric neutrino anomaly, speculations on the neutrinoless double β -decay, the tentative experimental evidence for a tensor coupling in the $\pi^- \rightarrow e^- + \bar{\nu}_e + \gamma$ decay, the dark matter problem, gamma-ray bursts etc. Therefore, searches of the models beyond the framework of the SM have some reasons.

As long as 1937 Majorana [1], Racah and Furry realised that it is possible to build symmetrical theory in which there is no difference between neutrino and its antineutrino. The essential ingredient of that theory is projecting the Dirac wave function into self/anti-self conjugate states that are supposed to answer for truly neutral particles. The interest in such the models is revived periodically in connection with important experimental observations (e. g, the discovery of the parity violation in weak processes in the end of the fifties) or with attractive theoretical constructs (e. g., Majorana models of neutrino follow from grand unification theories). The important reformulation of the Majorana theory has been undertaken by McLennan and Case [2]. The excellent pedagogical review of the topics related with Majorana (and his successors) ideas has been presented by Mannheim [3]. Models proposed by Sokolov [4] and Doi *et al.*, ref. [5], also deserve a certain attention.

Recently a new concept of Majorana-like fields has been proposed [6]. Namely, this concept is based on the use of the type-II $(j, 0) \oplus (0, j)$ self/anti-self conjugate spinors¹

$$\lambda(p^\mu) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} (\zeta_\lambda \Theta_{[j]}) \phi_L^*(p^\mu) \\ \phi_L(p^\mu) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho(p^\mu) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \phi_R(p^\mu) \\ (\zeta_\rho \Theta_{[j]})^* \phi_R^*(p^\mu) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

Phase factors ζ_λ and ζ_ρ are fixed by the conditions of self/anti-self θ -conjugacy:

$$S_{[1/2]}^c \lambda(p^\mu) = \pm \lambda(p^\mu), \quad S_{[1/2]}^c \rho(p^\mu) = \pm \rho(p^\mu) \quad , \quad (2)$$

for a $j = 1/2$ case; and

$$[\Gamma^5 S_{[1]}^c] \lambda(p^\mu) = \pm \lambda(p^\mu) \quad , \quad [\Gamma^5 S_{[1]}^c] \rho(p^\mu) = \pm \rho(p^\mu) \quad , \quad (3)$$

for a $j = 1$ case². The operators of the charge conjugation are defined as³

¹Under type-I spinors one understands the Dirac bispinors. Through this paper we use terminology and notation of the author of ref. [6]. The details of the formalism can be found in the cited papers.

²As shown in ref. [6b] self/anti-self $j = 1$ spinors do not exist in the framework of the construct proposed by Ahluwalia. Therefore, the operation $[\Gamma^5 S_{[1]}^c]$ has been defined there.

³Let us note that the definition of the charge conjugation matrix for a $j = 1$ case corresponds to the FNBWW-type quantum field construct [7]. The fact indicated in the previous footnote is connected with this definition. In the Weinberg-Tucker-Hammer construct [8,9] it is possible to define self/anti-self $j = 1$ conjugate spinors, see ref. [8a, p. B1327] for an alternative definition of the charge conjugation operator. The various models in the $(1, 0) \oplus (0, 1)$ representation space were also discussed in refs. [10–13].

$$S_{[1/2]}^c = e^{i\theta_{[1/2]}^c} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i\Theta_{[1/2]} \\ -i\Theta_{[1/2]} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{K} \equiv \mathcal{C}_{[1/2]} \mathcal{K} \quad , \quad (4)$$

$$S_{[1]}^c = e^{i\theta_{[1]}^c} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Theta_{[1]} \\ -\Theta_{[1]} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{K} \equiv \mathcal{C}_{[1]} \mathcal{K} \quad , \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{K}$ is the operation of the complex conjugation; and

$$(\Theta_{[j]})_{\sigma, \sigma'} = (-1)^{j+\sigma} \delta_{\sigma', -\sigma} \quad (6)$$

is the Wigner operator ($\Theta_{[j]} \mathbf{J} \Theta_{[j]}^{-1} = -\mathbf{J}^*$, with $\mathbf{J}$ being the angular momentum operator used in the definition of the Lorentz boosts). The wave equation for any spin has been given in ref. [6b,c] in the instant-front formulation of quantum field theory⁴:

$$\begin{pmatrix} -\mathbb{1} & \zeta_\lambda \exp(\mathbf{J} \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi}) \Theta_{[j]} \Xi_{[j]} \exp(\mathbf{J} \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi}) \\ \zeta_\lambda \exp(-\mathbf{J} \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi}) \Xi_{[j]}^{-1} \Theta_{[j]} \exp(-\mathbf{J} \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi}) & -\mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix} \lambda(p^\mu) = 0 \quad . \quad (7)$$

The particular cases ($j = 1/2$ and $j = 1$) are also presented there (Eqs. (31) and (32), respectively). The analogous equation in the light-front formulation could be found in ref. [6a]. The $\lambda^S(p^\mu)$ were shown to be the positive energy solutions with $E = +\sqrt{m^2 + \mathbf{p}^2}$, and $\lambda^A(p^\mu)$ are the negative energy solutions with $E = -\sqrt{m^2 + \mathbf{p}^2}$ for both spin-1/2 and spin-1 cases. However, to re-write those equations to covariant form is a difficult task. For instance, an attempt of the author of the formalism [6] to put the equation in the form $(\lambda^{\mu\nu} p_\mu p_\nu + m \lambda^\mu p_\mu - 2m^2 \mathbb{1}) \lambda(p^\mu) = 0$ was in a certain sense misleading. He noted himself: “it turns out that [matrices] $\lambda^{\mu\nu}$ and λ^μ do not transform as Poincaré tensors.” The aim of the present paper is to explain in what way the equations for $\lambda(p^\mu)$ and $\rho(p^\mu)$ spinors are re-written to covariant form.

The crucial point of deriving Eq. (7) is the generalized Ryder-Burgard relation for type-II spinors⁵:

$$[\phi_L^h(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu)]^* = \Xi_{[j]} \phi_L^h(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu) \quad , \quad (8)$$

where

$$\Xi_{[1/2]} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\phi} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\phi} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Xi_{[1]} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i2\phi} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{-i2\phi} \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad (9)$$

h is the helicity; ϕ is the azimuthal angle associated with $\mathbf{p}$. However, from the analysis of the parametrization of rest spinors (formulas 22a-23c of ref. [6c]) one can conclude that another form

⁴ $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ are the parameters of the Lorentz boost. In the case of bradyons they are defined by the formulas (3) of ref. [7].

⁵In ref. [7] the relation $\phi_R(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu) = \pm \phi_L(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu)$ for type-I Dirac-like rest spinors has been named as the Ryder-Burgard relation. Through this paper I also use this name, but I understand that similar formulas could be found in earlier papers and books. Read, e. g., the paragraphs surrounding equations (25,26) of Ch. 5, ref. [14].

of the generalized Ryder-Burgard relation is possible. Namely, the form connecting 2-spinors of the opposite helicity is:

$$\left[\phi_L^h(\hat{p}^\mu)\right]^* = (-1)^{1/2-h} e^{-i(\theta_1+\theta_2)} \Theta_{[1/2]} \phi_L^{-h}(\hat{p}^\mu) \quad , \quad (10)$$

for a $j = 1/2$ case; and

$$\left[\phi_L^h(\hat{p}^\mu)\right]^* = (-1)^{1-h} e^{-i\delta} \Theta_{[1]} \phi_L^{-h}(\hat{p}^\mu) \quad , \quad (11)$$

for a $j = 1$ case ($\delta = \delta_1 + \delta_3$ for $h = \pm 1$ and $\delta = 2\delta_2$, for $h = 0$).

Provided that the overall phase factors of the rest spinors are chosen to be $\theta_1 + \theta_2 = 0$ (or 2π) in a spin-1/2 case and $\delta_1 + \delta_3 = 0 = \delta_2$, in a spin-1 case, the Ryder-Burgard relation is written

$$\left[\phi_L^h(\hat{p}^\mu)\right]^* = (-1)^{j-h} \Theta_{[j]} \phi_L^{-h}(\hat{p}^\mu) \quad . \quad (12)$$

This choice is convenient for calculations. The same relations exist for right-handed spinors $\phi_R(\hat{p}^\mu)$ in both a $j = 1/2$ case and a $j = 1$ case. By using (12) and following to the procedure of deriving the wave equation developed in ref. [6] one can obtain for a $j = 1/2$ case ($\hat{p} = \gamma^\mu p_\mu$):

$$[i\hat{p} - m\gamma_5] \Psi_{+1/2}^S(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad [i\hat{p} + m\gamma_5] \Psi_{+1/2}^A(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad (13)$$

$$[i\hat{p} + m\gamma_5] \Psi_{-1/2}^S(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad [i\hat{p} - m\gamma_5] \Psi_{-1/2}^A(p^\mu) = 0 \quad . \quad (14)$$

Here we defined new spinor functions:

$$\Psi_{+1/2}^S(p^\mu) = \begin{pmatrix} i\Theta_{1/2} [\phi_L^{-1/2}(p^\mu)]^* \\ \phi_L^{+1/2}(p^\mu) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad \Psi_{+1/2}^S(p^\mu) = -i \begin{pmatrix} \phi_R^{+1/2}(p^\mu) \\ -i\Theta_{1/2} [\phi_R^{-1/2}(p^\mu)]^* \end{pmatrix} , \quad (15)$$

$$\Psi_{-1/2}^S(p^\mu) = \begin{pmatrix} i\Theta_{1/2} [\phi_L^{+1/2}(p^\mu)]^* \\ \phi_L^{-1/2}(p^\mu) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad \Psi_{-1/2}^S(p^\mu) = i \begin{pmatrix} \phi_R^{-1/2}(p^\mu) \\ -i\Theta_{1/2} [\phi_R^{+1/2}(p^\mu)]^* \end{pmatrix} , \quad (16)$$

$$\Psi_{+1/2}^A(p^\mu) = \begin{pmatrix} -i\Theta_{1/2} [\phi_L^{-1/2}(p^\mu)]^* \\ \phi_L^{+1/2}(p^\mu) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad \Psi_{+1/2}^A(p^\mu) = i \begin{pmatrix} \phi_R^{+1/2}(p^\mu) \\ i\Theta_{1/2} [\phi_R^{-1/2}(p^\mu)]^* \end{pmatrix} , \quad (17)$$

$$\Psi_{-1/2}^A(p^\mu) = \begin{pmatrix} -i\Theta_{1/2} [\phi_L^{+1/2}(p^\mu)]^* \\ \phi_L^{-1/2}(p^\mu) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad \Psi_{-1/2}^A(p^\mu) = -i \begin{pmatrix} \phi_R^{-1/2}(p^\mu) \\ i\Theta_{1/2} [\phi_R^{+1/2}(p^\mu)]^* \end{pmatrix} . \quad (18)$$

As opposed to $\lambda(p^\mu)$ and $\rho(p^\mu)$ these spinor functions are the eigenfunctions of the helicity operator of the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation space, but they are not self/anti-self conjugate spinors.

The equations (13,14) can also be obtained by the procedure described in footnote # 1 of ref. [6c] with type-I spinors ($\Psi = \text{column}(\phi_R(p^\mu) \quad \phi_L(p^\mu))$) if imply that the Ryder-Burgard relation has the form

$$\phi_R(\hat{p}^\mu) = \pm i \phi_L(\hat{p}^\mu) \quad . \quad (19)$$

The equations (13,14) have been discussed in the old literature (e. g., ref. [15]). Their relevance to the problem of describing the neutrino has been noted in the cited paper. By using the formulas relating Ψ , Eq. (15-18), with self/anti-self conjugate spinors it is easy to find corresponding equations for spinors $\lambda(p^\mu)$ and $\rho(p^\mu)$. For the case of spin-1/2 field we obtain

$$\hat{p}\lambda_{\uparrow}^S(p^\mu) + im\lambda_{\downarrow}^S(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad \hat{p}\rho_{\uparrow}^S(p^\mu) - im\rho_{\downarrow}^S(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad (20)$$

$$\hat{p}\lambda_{\downarrow}^S(p^\mu) - im\lambda_{\uparrow}^S(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad \hat{p}\rho_{\downarrow}^S(p^\mu) + im\rho_{\uparrow}^S(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad (21)$$

$$\hat{p}\lambda_{\uparrow}^A(p^\mu) - im\lambda_{\downarrow}^A(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad \hat{p}\rho_{\uparrow}^A(p^\mu) + im\rho_{\downarrow}^A(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad (22)$$

$$\hat{p}\lambda_{\downarrow}^A(p^\mu) + im\lambda_{\uparrow}^A(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad \hat{p}\rho_{\downarrow}^A(p^\mu) - im\rho_{\uparrow}^A(p^\mu) = 0 \quad . \quad (23)$$

If imply similarly to [6c] that $\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}^S(p^\mu)$ (and $\rho_{\uparrow\downarrow}^A(p^\mu)$) are the positive-energy solutions and $\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}^A(p^\mu)$ (and $\rho_{\uparrow\downarrow}^S(p^\mu)$) are the negative-energy solutions, the equations (20-23) in the coordinate space can be written

$$\partial_\mu \gamma^\mu \lambda_\eta(x) + \wp_{\uparrow\downarrow} m \lambda_{-\eta}(x) = 0 \quad , \quad (24)$$

$$\partial_\mu \gamma^\mu \rho_\eta(x) + \wp_{\uparrow\downarrow} m \rho_{-\eta}(x) = 0 \quad , \quad (25)$$

where $\wp_{\uparrow\downarrow} = \pm 1$ with the sign is “+” if $\eta = \uparrow$ and the sign is “-” if $\eta = \downarrow$. The indices η ($\uparrow$ or $\downarrow$) should be referred to the chiral helicity introduced in [6b,p.10]. This form (Eqs. (24) and (25)) is very similar to the Dirac equation, however, the sign at the mass term can be opposite and the spinors enter in the equations with opposite chiral helicities. The Dirac equation with opposite sign at the mass term had been considered (in different aspects) in refs. [16–18]. Eqs. (24,25) should be compared with the new form of the Weinberg equation for $j = 1$ spinors in a coordinate representation, ref. [7].

One can incorporate the same chiral helicity states in equations by using the identities (48a,b) of ref. [6c]

$$\rho_{\uparrow}^S(p^\mu) = -i\lambda_{\downarrow}^A(p^\mu) \quad , \quad \rho_{\downarrow}^S(p^\mu) = +i\lambda_{\uparrow}^A(p^\mu) \quad , \quad (26)$$

$$\rho_{\uparrow}^A(p^\mu) = +i\lambda_{\downarrow}^S(p^\mu) \quad , \quad \rho_{\downarrow}^A(p^\mu) = -i\lambda_{\uparrow}^S(p^\mu) \quad . \quad (27)$$

Thus, one can come to

$$\hat{p}\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}^S(p^\mu) + m\rho_{\uparrow\downarrow}^A(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad \hat{p}\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}^A(p^\mu) + m\rho_{\uparrow\downarrow}^S(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad (28)$$

$$\hat{p}\rho_{\uparrow\downarrow}^S(p^\mu) + m\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}^A(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad \hat{p}\rho_{\uparrow\downarrow}^A(p^\mu) + m\lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}^S(p^\mu) = 0 \quad . \quad (29)$$

It is also useful to note the connection between the type-II spinors $\lambda(p^\mu)$ and $\rho(p^\mu)$ and the type-I Dirac spinor $\psi^D(p^\mu)$ and the charge conjugate to it $(\psi^D(p^\mu))^c$:

$$\lambda^S(p^\mu) = \frac{1 - \gamma_5}{2} \psi^D(p^\mu) + \frac{1 + \gamma_5}{2} (\psi^D(p^\mu))^c \quad , \quad (30)$$

$$\lambda^A(p^\mu) = \frac{1 - \gamma_5}{2} \psi^D(p^\mu) - \frac{1 + \gamma_5}{2} (\psi^D(p^\mu))^c \quad , \quad (31)$$

$$\rho^S(p^\mu) = \frac{1 + \gamma_5}{2} \psi^D(p^\mu) + \frac{1 - \gamma_5}{2} (\psi^D(p^\mu))^c \quad , \quad (32)$$

$$\rho^A(p^\mu) = \frac{1 + \gamma_5}{2} \psi^D(p^\mu) - \frac{1 - \gamma_5}{2} (\psi^D(p^\mu))^c \quad . \quad (33)$$

Then the equations (28,29) could be re-written in the form with the type-I spinors:

$$(\hat{p} + m) \psi_{\pm 1/2}^D(p^\mu) + (\hat{p} + m) \gamma_5 (\psi_{\pm 1/2}^D(p^\mu))^c = 0 \quad , \quad (34)$$

$$(\hat{p} - m) \gamma_5 \psi_{\pm 1/2}^D(p^\mu) - (\hat{p} - m) (\psi_{\pm 1/2}^D(p^\mu))^c = 0 \quad , \quad (35)$$

$$(\hat{p} + m) \psi_{\pm 1/2}^D(p^\mu) - (\hat{p} + m) \gamma_5 (\psi_{\pm 1/2}^D(p^\mu))^c = 0 \quad , \quad (36)$$

$$(\hat{p} - m) \gamma_5 \psi_{\pm 1/2}^D(p^\mu) + (\hat{p} - m) (\psi_{\pm 1/2}^D(p^\mu))^c = 0 \quad . \quad (37)$$

So, we can consider the $(\psi_h^D(p^\mu))^c$ (or $\gamma_5\psi_h^D(p^\mu)$, or their sum) as the positive-energy solutions of the Dirac equation and $\psi_h^D(p^\mu)$ (or $\gamma_5(\psi_h^D(p^\mu))^c$, or their sum) as the negative-energy solutions. The field operator can be defined

$$\Psi = \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{2p_0} \sum_h \left[(\psi_h^D(p^\mu))^c a_h \exp(-ip \cdot x) + \psi_h^D(p^\mu) b_h^\dagger \exp(ip \cdot x) \right] \quad . \quad (38)$$

The similar formulation has been developed by Nigam and Foldy [19].

Let us note a interesting feature. We can obtain another interpretation ($\psi^D(p^\mu)$ corresponds to the positive-energy solutions and $(\psi^D(p^\mu))^c$, to the negative ones) if choose other overall phase factors in the definitions of the rest-spinors $\phi_L(\hat{p}^\mu)$ and $\phi_R(\hat{p}^\mu)$, formulas (22a-23c) of ref. [6c]. Namely, the signs at the mass term depend on the form of the generalized Ryder-Burgard relation; if $\theta_1 + \theta_2 = \pi$ the signs would be opposite. One can obtain the generalized equations (20-23) for the arbitrary choice of the phase factor. For $\lambda^S(p^\mu)$ spinors they are following:

$$\begin{cases} i\hat{p}\lambda_\uparrow^S(p^\mu) - m\mathcal{T}\lambda_\downarrow^S(p^\mu) = 0 \\ i\hat{p}\lambda_\downarrow^S(p^\mu) + m\mathcal{T}\lambda_\uparrow^S(p^\mu) = 0 \end{cases} \quad , \quad (39)$$

where

$$\mathcal{T} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i(\theta_1+\theta_2)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i(\theta_1+\theta_2)} \end{pmatrix} \quad . \quad (40)$$

In the case $\theta_1 + \theta_2 = \pm\frac{\pi}{2}$ we also have the correct physical dispersion, $p_0^2 - \mathbf{p}^2 = m^2$ for $\lambda(p^\mu)$ spinors.

Next, one can see from (24,25) that neither $\lambda^{S,A}(x)$ nor $\rho^{S,A}(x)$ are the eigenfunctions of the Hamiltonian operator (we have different chiral helicity in the “Dirac” equations). They are not in mass eigenstates. However ψ^D and $(\psi^D)^c$ are in mass and helicity eigenstates. Taking into account the discussion on the positive- and negative- energy solutions and the interpretation of “antiparticle” as the particle moving backward in time [20]⁶ we are ready to put forward the question: can the high-energy neutrino described by the field

$$\nu^{ML} \equiv \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{2p_0} \sum_\eta \left[\lambda_\eta^S(p^\mu) a_\eta(p^\mu) \exp(-ip \cdot x) + \lambda_\eta^A(p^\mu) a_\eta^\dagger(p^\mu) \exp(ip \cdot x) \right] \quad (41)$$

“oscillate” from the state of one chiral helicity to another chiral helicity (e. g., $\lambda_\uparrow^S \leftrightarrow \lambda_\downarrow^A$) with the “oscillation length” being of the order of the wavelength of de Broglie? Let us recall that the idea of oscillations of the left-handed neutrino into its CP conjugate particle has been proposed by Pontecorvo [21] long ago. It is useful to repeat [6] that $\lambda_\downarrow^{S,A}$ and $\rho_\uparrow^{S,A}$ are the only surviving spinors in the massless limit.

⁶More precisely: in ref. [19] it was shown that even without a resort to a plane-wave expansion, if the eigenvector ϕ has the eigenvalue “−1” of the normalized Hamiltonian $\hat{H}/|E|$ in the Hilbert space, then ϕ^c has the eigenvalue “+1”. This fact leads to the conclusion that the matrix element $\langle \lambda^A(0), \downarrow | \lambda^S(t), \uparrow \rangle$ has the non-zero value at the time t .

For the case spin-1 the situation differs in some aspects. If accept another formulation of the Burgard-Ryder relation (12) one has⁷

$$\gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu \lambda_\uparrow^S(p^\mu) - m^2 \lambda_\downarrow^S(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad \gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu \rho_\uparrow^S(p^\mu) - m^2 \rho_\downarrow^S(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad (42)$$

$$\gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu \lambda_\downarrow^S(p^\mu) - m^2 \lambda_\uparrow^S(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad \gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu \rho_\downarrow^S(p^\mu) - m^2 \rho_\uparrow^S(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad (43)$$

$$\gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu \lambda_\rightarrow^S(p^\mu) + m^2 \lambda_\rightarrow^S(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad \gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu \rho_\rightarrow^S(p^\mu) + m^2 \rho_\rightarrow^S(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad (44)$$

$$\gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu \lambda_\uparrow^A(p^\mu) + m^2 \lambda_\downarrow^A(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad \gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu \rho_\uparrow^A(p^\mu) + m^2 \rho_\downarrow^A(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad (45)$$

$$\gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu \lambda_\downarrow^A(p^\mu) + m^2 \lambda_\uparrow^A(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad \gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu \rho_\downarrow^A(p^\mu) + m^2 \rho_\uparrow^A(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad (46)$$

$$\gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu \lambda_\rightarrow^A(p^\mu) - m^2 \lambda_\rightarrow^A(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad \gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu \rho_\rightarrow^A(p^\mu) - m^2 \rho_\rightarrow^A(p^\mu) = 0 \quad . \quad (47)$$

There exist the identities analogous to (26,27). For instance, under the choice of the phase factors as $\delta_1^R + \delta_3^R = 2\pi$, $\delta_1^L + \delta_3^L = 0$ and $\delta_2^L = \delta_2^R - \pi = 0$ we have

$$\rho_\uparrow^S(p^\mu) = -\lambda_\downarrow^S(p^\mu) \quad , \quad \rho_\downarrow^S(p^\mu) = -\lambda_\uparrow^S(p^\mu) \quad , \quad \rho_\rightarrow^S(p^\mu) = +\lambda_\rightarrow^S(p^\mu) \quad , \quad (48)$$

$$\rho_\uparrow^A(p^\mu) = +\lambda_\downarrow^A(p^\mu) \quad , \quad \rho_\downarrow^A(p^\mu) = +\lambda_\uparrow^A(p^\mu) \quad , \quad \rho_\rightarrow^A(p^\mu) = -\lambda_\rightarrow^A(p^\mu) \quad . \quad (49)$$

Therefore,

$$\gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu \lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}^S(p^\mu) + m^2 \rho_{\uparrow\downarrow}^S(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad \gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu \lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}^A(p^\mu) + m^2 \rho_{\uparrow\downarrow}^A(p^\mu) = 0 \quad (50)$$

$$\gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu \rho_{\uparrow\downarrow}^S(p^\mu) + m^2 \lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}^S(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad \gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu \rho_{\uparrow\downarrow}^A(p^\mu) + m^2 \lambda_{\uparrow\downarrow}^A(p^\mu) = 0 \quad (51)$$

Applying the relations between type-II and type-I spinors which looks like similar to (30-33) except for $\rho^S \leftrightarrow \rho^A$ we obtain

$$(\gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu + m^2) \psi^D(p^\mu) + (\gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu + m^2) \gamma_5(\psi^D(p^\mu))^c = 0 \quad , \quad (52)$$

$$(\gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu - m^2) \gamma_5 \psi^D(p^\mu) - (\gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu - m^2) (\psi^D(p^\mu))^c = 0 \quad , \quad (53)$$

$$(\gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu + m^2) \psi^D(p^\mu) - (\gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu + m^2) \gamma_5(\psi^D(p^\mu))^c = 0 \quad , \quad (54)$$

$$(\gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu - m^2) \gamma_5 \psi^D(p^\mu) + (\gamma_{\mu\nu}p^\mu p^\nu - m^2) (\psi^D(p^\mu))^c = 0 \quad . \quad (55)$$

This tells us that ψ^D (or $\gamma_5(\psi^D)^c$) should be considered as the negative-energy solutions of the modified Weinberg equation [7] and $(\psi^D)^c$ (or $\gamma_5 \psi^D$) as the positive-energy ones. Like the equations (24,25) one can write

$$\gamma^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \partial_\nu \lambda_\eta(x) + \wp_{S,A} \lambda_{-\eta}(x) = 0 \quad , \quad (56)$$

$$\gamma^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \partial_\nu \rho_\eta(x) + \wp_{S,A} \rho_{-\eta}(x) = 0 \quad , \quad (57)$$

where $\wp_{S,A} = \pm 1$, the sign is “+” for positive-energy solution $\lambda^S(p^\mu)$ (or $\rho^S(p^\mu)$) and the sign is “-”, for negative-energy solutions $\lambda^A(p^\mu)$ (or $\rho^A(p^\mu)$). This refers to the $\eta = \uparrow$ or $\eta = \downarrow$. As for $\eta = \rightarrow$ it is easy to see that the equations (44) and (47) have the opposite sign at mass term.

⁷Again, one can obtain the opposite signs in the equations if imply $\delta_1 + \delta_3 = \pi$ for $\phi_L(\hat{p}^\mu)$ and, correspondingly, for $\phi_R(\hat{p}^\mu)$.

The presence of $\wp_{\uparrow\downarrow}$ in a $j = 1/2$ case or $\wp_{S,A}$ in a $j = 1$ case hints that we obtained the examples of the FNBWW-type quantum field theory. In fact, the analysis of the field operator (38) in the Fock space [19,6c] revealed that fermion and its antifermion can possess same intrinsic parities. Bosons described by the Eqs. (52-55) are found following to ref. [7] to be able to carry opposite intrinsic parities. However, let us not forget about other constructs [8,9,13] in the $(1,0) \oplus (0,1)$ representation space. Their investigations deserve further elaboration.

Acknowledgements. I greatly appreciate many useful advises of Profs. D. V. Ahluwalia, A. F. Pashkov and Yu. F. Smirnov. The questions of Prof. M. Moreno and Prof. A. Turbiner helped me to realise the necessity of the study of neutral particles.

I am grateful to Zacatecas University for a professorship.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Majorana, *Nuovo Cim.* **14** (1937) 171 [English translation: D. A. Sinclair, Tech. Trans. TT-542, Nat. Res. Council of Canada]
- [2] J. A. McLennan, *Phys. Rev.* **106** (1957) 821; K. M. Case, *Phys. Rev.* **107** (1957) 307
- [3] P. D. Mannheim, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **23** (1984) 643
- [4] A. A. Sokolov, *ZhETF* **33** (1957) 794 [English translation: *Sov. Phys. JETP* **6** (1958) 611]
- [5] M. Doi *et al.*, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **70** (1983) 1331
- [6] D. V. Ahluwalia, M. B. Johnson and T. Goldman, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A9** (1994) 439; D. V. Ahluwalia, “Incompatibility of self-charge conjugation with helicity eigenstates and gauge interactions.” Preprint LANL LA-UR-94-1252 (hep-th/9404100), Los Alamos, Apr. 1994; “McLennan-Case construct for neutrino, its generalization, and a fundamentally new wave equation.” Preprint LANL LA-UR-94-3118 (hep-th/9409134), Los Alamos, Sept. 1994
- [7] D. V. Ahluwalia, M. B. Johnson and T. Goldman, *Phys. Lett.* **B316** (1993) 102
- [8] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev.* **B133** (1964) 1318; *ibid* **134** (1964) 882; *ibid* **181** (1969) 1893
- [9] R. H. Tucker and C. L. Hammer, *Phys. Rev.* **D3** (1971) 2448 (see also D. Shay and R. H. Good, *Phys. Rev.* **179** (1969) 1410)
- [10] A. Sankaranarayanan and R. H. Good, jr., *Nuovo Cim.* **36** (1965) 1303; *Phys. Rev.* **B140** (1965) 509; A. Sankaranarayanan, *Nuovo Cim.* **38** (1965) 889
- [11] D. V. Ahluwalia and D. J. Ernst, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A7** (1992) 1967
- [12] V. V. Dvoeglazov, *Rev. Mex. Fis. Suppl.* **40** (1) (1994) 352
- [13] V. V. Dvoeglazov, “Mapping between antisymmetric tensor and Weinberg formulations.” Preprint EFUAZ FT-94-05 (hep-th/9408077), Zacatecas, Aug. 1994; “What particles are described by the Weinberg theory?” Preprint EFUAZ FT-94-06 (hep-th/9408146), Zacatecas, Aug. 1994; “The Weinberg propagators.” Preprint EFUAZ FT-94-07 (hep-th/9408176), Zacatecas, Aug. 1994; “Can the Weinberg-Tucker-Hammer equations describe the electromagnetic field?” Preprint EFUAZ FT-94-09-REV (hep-th/9410174), Zacatecas, Oct. 1994
- [14] Yu. V. Novozhilov, “Vvedenie v teoriyu elementarnykh chastitz.” (Nauka, Moscow, 1971) [English translation: “Introduction to elementary particle theory.” (Pergamon Press, Oxford, UK, 1975)]
- [15] G. A. Sokolik, *ZhETF* **33** (1957) 1515 [English translation: *Sov. Phys. JETP* **6** (1958) 1170]
- [16] M. A. Markov, *ZhETF* **7** (1937) 603; “About two types of the Dirac fields.” Preprint JINR D-1345, Dubna, 1963; “Neutrino.” (Nauka, Moscow, 1964)
- [17] F. J. Belinfante, *Physica* **6** (1939) 849, 870, 887; F. J. Belinfante and W. Pauli, *Physica* **7** (1940) 177
- [18] J. Brana and K. Ljolje, *Fizika* **12** (1980) 287
- [19] B. P. Nigam and L. L. Foldy, *Phys. Rev.* **102** (1956) 1410
- [20] E. C. G. Stückelberg, *Helv. Phys. Acta* **14** (1941) 32L, 588; R. P. Feynman, *Phys. Rev.* **76** (1949) 749
- [21] B. M. Pontecorvo, *ZhETF* **33** (1957) 549; *ibid* **34** (1958) 247 *ibid* **53** (1967) 171 [English translation: *Sov. Phys. JETP* **6** (1958) 429; *ibid* **7** (1958) 172; *ibid* **26** (1968) 984]